

The University of Akron

IdeaExchange@UAkron

The University of Akron Faculty Senate Chronicle

4-27-1989

Faculty Senate Chronicle April 27, 1989

Heather M. Loughney

Follow this and additional works at: <https://ideaexchange.uakron.edu/universityofakronfacultysenate>

Please take a moment to share how this work helps you [through this survey](#). Your feedback will be important as we plan further development of our repository.

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by IdeaExchange@UAkron, the institutional repository of The University of Akron in Akron, Ohio, USA. It has been accepted for inclusion in The University of Akron Faculty Senate Chronicle by an authorized administrator of IdeaExchange@UAkron. For more information, please contact mjon@uakron.edu, uapress@uakron.edu.



TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Minutes of Meeting of University Council of 4/6/89.....	2
Appendix to Minutes of University Council Meeting of 4/6/89	
A. Library and Learning Resources Committee Resolutions to Improve Library Security.....	19
B. Report of Faculty Research Grants Submitted and Percent Funded for 1983 through 1989 and 1988-89.....	22
C. Report of the UA Representative, Faculty Advisory Committee to the Chancellor, Ohio Board of Regents.....	25
D. Amendment to <u>Faculty Manual</u> section 3359-20-02 Organization of the University (5) (vi).....	28

Any comments concerning the contents of The University of Akron Chronicle may be directed to the Office of the Senior Vice President and Provost.

MINUTES OF UNIVERSITY COUNCIL MEETING
April 6, 1989

The regular meeting of the University Council was called to order by the Chairman, Senior Vice President and Provost, Dr. Frank Marini, at 3:04 p.m. on Thursday, April 6, 1989 in Leigh Hall 307.

Fifty-two of the 82 members of Council were present. Those absent with notice were Associate Provost Hilton Bonniwell, Associate Provost Robert Dubick, Director of ULLR George Hodowanec, Dean James Long, Acting Dean John Watt, Dr. Dolores Bower, Dr. Diana Chlebek, Dr. Roger Creel, Mr. Richard DiRienzo, Dr. Roger Durbin, Dr. Lawrence Focht, Mr. Elton Glaser, Mr. Forrest Smith, Mr. Mark Soppeland, and Dr. Walter Yoder. Absent without notice were Dean Frank Kelley, Dr. Eric Birdsall, Dr. David Bernstein, Dr. F. Harris, Dr. A. Isayev, Dr. Paul Lam, Dr. David Timmerman, Dr. Judy Wilkinson, Associated Student Government Representatives Tony Brown, Andrew Milligan and Michelle Walulik, Graduate Student Government Representative Cindy Porter, Non-Traditional Student Government Representatives Carol Adams and Leigh Cromleigh, and Student Bar Association Representative Parker Edmiston.

Item No. 1 - Remarks of the President. The Chairman introduced President Muse, whose remarks were as follows:

Thank you. I wanted to inform you about a couple of events that either have occurred or are occurring on the campus. The first is that yesterday the Board of Trustees and members of University administration had an all-day retreat concerning next year's budget. Perhaps some of you have read reports of that in the local press. I should emphasize in the beginning that no decisions were made yesterday. The purpose of the retreat was to permit us to discuss in depth with the Trustees the current financial situation within the University, within the State, and our planning for next year's budget; and I think we were able to make the Trustees more aware of the financial needs of the University, the kind of funding that it will need in order to meet its goals. We're still hopeful that the level of State funding will increase. The Senate has yet to act on the appropriations bill, and we should find out in late May - sometime in that general time frame - what their recommendation will be. If we do not, however, receive significant additional State funding over what the House of Representatives has recommended, we will very likely need to consider an additional tuition increase at the June Board meeting - and that could go as high as 14 percent. That was the number we were looking at yesterday to balance a budget based upon projection of continuing cost, providing what we feel would be a reasonable salary increase, and some increase in operating costs for the University. We're still on a plan of presenting to the Trustees at the June meeting our budget for next year. By that time we will know what the Senate has recommended; we should know what the level of State funding is; we should know what kind of additional tuition increase will be needed.

The second item I wanted to inform you about is that when I accepted the job here as President, there was an agreement with the Board of Trustees that they would evaluate my performance in a very comprehensive way at the end of five years; and that's consistent with the evaluation process - evaluation period - that we're looking at for deans and vice presidents. The Board has, of course, made an annual assessment of my performance. To conduct the five-year review, the Chairman of the Board decided to use a procedure which is currently being used by a number of universities, and that is using a review panel from outside the institution; and he therefore contacted the President of the American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU) and asked him to recommend to the University a list of presidents who he felt were qualified to do this job. From that list the Chairman of the Board selected three presidents, and they are currently on campus; they arrived yesterday and will be leaving on Friday. While they are on the campus they will be meeting with members of the faculty, the staff, administration, students, with the Trustees, and with various community leaders to obtain their input. In addition to that, prior to their arrival they were furnished with a considerable number of reports that they asked for and information that they requested. After their visit, the team will provide to the Board of Trustees a report of their findings during their visit here. For your information, the members of the team are President Edward M. Penson of the University of Wisconsin at Oshkosh, President James Appleberry of Northern Michigan University, and President Harold Haak of California State University at Fresno. If any of you who have not had the opportunity wish to make input to the team, you're free to contact Charlene Reed, who's Secretary of the Board and who's coordinating the visit, and I'm sure she'll be happy to provide opportunities for you to do so.

I want also to give you some feedback on a couple of issues that are being considered. First is that I have reviewed the "Statement on Teaching Evaluations" that you submitted, and I will be submitting those recommended guidelines to the Board of Trustees for their consideration and approval at the April Board meeting.

In my opinion, teaching is clearly the most important task, the most important activity at The University of Akron; and it's important that it be evaluated regularly, and with the utmost care and sensitivity.

I, therefore, applaud your efforts to ensure that the evaluation of teaching be done systematically, and that the results of the evaluations be used appropriately.

In supporting the statement, I want to clearly communicate a couple of expectations that I'd like to be understood:

- α The first is that each class should be evaluated by the appropriate procedures each semester. The more observations or measurements we have, the more confident

we can be of the conclusions that are drawn from the data.

- Secondly, the procedures developed by the departmental or college faculties should, in all cases, be reviewed and approved by the appropriate college dean and by the Provost, with any changes in these procedures subject to that same approval. I think it's important that the procedures that we use be as consistent as possible across the campus and, certainly, they should all be in conformity with the University-wide guidelines.

Lastly, let me report to you that I think it was at the last meeting of University Council that I attended I related my concerns about the issue of how we report service to STRS and ways in which we could support our part-time faculty members without understating the actual work which full-time faculty members perform as a part of their regular employment. I informed you at that time that, after the regulations were available, if we were able to determine with reasonable certainty that changes in our STRS reporting would have no adverse consequences to our full-time faculty, I would recommend the changes as indicated to be effective with the next fiscal period commencing July 1, 1989. The regulations implementing Section 89 of the Tax Reform Act of 1986 were published in the Federal Register on March 7, 1989. Our preliminary analysis of these regulations reveals that use of the proposed formula for STRS reporting purposes might cause adverse consequences to a large percentage of the full-time faculty. I'm advised that there are various nondiscrimination tests used to determine Section 89 compliance. Use of the proposed STRS reporting formula might cause the inclusion of part-time employees along with full-time employees for purposes of Section 89 nondiscrimination tests. The inclusion of part-time employees might well cause the University to fail these nondiscrimination tests; thus, the University would be required to report to the IRS as taxable income the excess benefits received by a substantial number of full-time faculty. I continue to be concerned about the impact that Section 89 may have on the University's overall benefits program and full-time employees, as well as our ability to make favorable changes in how service to STRS is reported for our part-time faculty. Therefore, I've directed appropriate administrative offices to conduct a review of the applicable IRS Code provisions and the new Section 89 regulations, and to provide me with all of the available options. As soon as I have that analysis, we ought to be able to make a final conclusion on this particular matter.

With that, I have no further prepared remarks and would be happy to try to answer your questions. Thank you.

Item No. 2 - Consideration of the Minutes of the Special Meeting of University Council of February 23, 1989 and the Minutes of the Regular Meeting of University Council of March 2, 1989, as printed in The University of Akron Chronicle on March 27, 1989. Dr. Gary Oller,

Secretary, announced that no corrections to the minutes of either meeting had been received. Dr. Tom Miles asked that the minutes be corrected to indicate that he was present at the February 23 meeting. He noted that he had sent that correction to the Secretary, and Dr. Oller apologized for the error. Dr. Maryhelen Kreidler, who had also been listed as absent without notice from that meeting, had been present.

The minutes were then approved as corrected.

Item No. 3 - Remarks of the Presiding Officer. In the interest of saving time, the Chairman presented no remarks.

Item No. 4 - Special Announcements. There were none.

Item No. 5 - Reports of Standing Committees.

A. Executive Committee - Dr. Oller, Secretary, reported that the Committee had met on March 17 and had first discussed the question of Council representation for Contract Professionals. The issue had been an item of New Business at the last meeting of Council; and two proposals which the Executive Committee had received had been attached to the agenda for the information of Council members, but neither had been proposed for acceptance. Council had not reached this item at the last meeting, and there was concern that since the issue related to a change in Council Bylaws, if a proposal was not moved at the April meeting in order to be discussed in May, no action could be taken this year. The Committee decided that Dr. Frank Griffin would introduce Dr. Irv Brandel's proposal and also remind Council members to be aware of the second as a possible source for substitute language or amendments to be raised in the discussion of the proposal at the May meeting.

The Committee then discussed the remaining items under Unfinished Business and General Orders and decided to reorder them as they appeared in the agenda for the April 6 meeting. The explanation for this reordering was so that routine matters which could be dealt with briefly - such as the introduction of the proposal for Contract Professional representation and the amendment for a secret ballot - would not be buried by the larger items, like the Faculty Ombudsman, which could take much time. One item of New Business - amending the Council Bylaws by striking item D of 3359-10-03, relating to the composition of Council, was placed on the agenda.

Finally, the Committee discussed the sheet to be sent out to faculty for choice of committee assignments for 1989-90.

B. Academic Planning and Priorities Committee - The Chairman announced that the Committee was meeting more or less once a week and had been going through college planning updates with some considerable care. Considering the pace at which it was moving, he was not certain that the Committee would get through them all. He thought that substantial critiques were being developed which could be circulated to people before the requests for next year's updates were made. He noted that the Committee was working well.

C. Academic Policies, Curriculum and Calendar Committee - Associate Provost Constance Cooper, the Chair, began by asking Council to approve the degree candidates for the 1989 May commencement. Copies of the list of expected graduates had been circulated by the Registrar's Office and were available at the meeting. The motion was seconded, and Council then voted its approval of the list.

Provost Cooper then presented a list of curricula proposals which the Committee had approved on March 28 without objection and moved that Council approve them as well. These included AS-89-11, 12, 14, 39; BA-89-08; CT-89-19, 22, 24, 26, 28, 31, 32, 35, 36, 37; ED-89-04, 05, 07, 08; EN-89-24, 25; FAA-89-02, 10, 11, 12, 18, 19, 42; WC-89-02, 03, 04 and 05. The motion was seconded, and all the proposals were approved by Council.

Associate Provost Cooper then moved that UC-89-01 be approved, and noted that the Committee had passed it with one objection still outstanding. She stated that Dr. John Gwinn, the Chairman of the NEOUCOM Advisory Committee to the Provost was in Council and would be willing to speak about this proposal. The motion was then seconded.

Acting Dean Glenn Atwood said that since this particular proposal dealt with the Honors Program and the University was in the midst of a major review of that program, he believed that it was inappropriate for Council to consider this now. He moved to refer the proposal to the committee which was studying the University Honors Program for inclusion in its considerations. This was seconded by Dr. Don R. Gerlach.

Dr. Mary Rainey asked for clarification on the nature of the proposal. Associate Provost Cooper responded that the proposal suggested a revision of the Honors Program to allow students in the NEOUCOM program to go through an Honors track. The rationale in the proposal read as follows:

When the Honors Program began, students enrolled in the BS/MD six-year program were not allowed to participate. Part of the rationale for preventing the students from Honors consideration stemmed from the fact that the BS/MD students complete a four-year bachelor of science degree on our campus in two-and-one-half years. The curriculum demands would not permit taking required Honors Colloquia and writing an Honors Thesis. The attached proposal provides a system by which BS/MD students can meet both Honors requirements and medical school entrance requirements while completing a major in Natural Sciences.

Associate Provost Cooper then noted that the objection had been made by Dean Atwood and read as follows: "This rationale for adding to the pool is fuzzy and BS/MD students are exempted from completing all three colloquia. This should be held until the 'Honors Task Force' completes their work."

Dr. Keith Klafehn, speaking as a member of the Honors Council, stated that this had been discussed at great length in the Honors Council and the judgment had been made that some very bright students

might be lost to our sister institutions because they had honors programs which admitted medical students and we did not. The Honors Council had decided that it would be in the best interests of the University and students to have medical students in the Honors Program. He did not think that the proposal should be referred back and ought to be passed.

Dean Marion Ruebel also spoke against Dean Atwood's motion. Council had no assurances or guarantees that the Honors Task Force would complete its work quickly or even adopt this proposal.

Dr. Dale Jackson also spoke against the motion and in favor of the proposal. The students in NEUOCOM were certainly among the brightest freshmen in the University, and there was absolutely no doubt of their ability and their performance. They took what was probably among the most difficult and intensive curriculum that the University had to offer and worked all summer long with a heavy load, easily carrying 20 hours a semester. He did not think that it was appropriate to exclude them from the program now or to delay it for another year.

After Acting Dean Atwood restated his motion, "that Council refer this proposal (UC-89-01) to the appropriate committee which is currently looking at revising the Honors Program," the Chairman called for a vote. The motion was defeated.

Dr. William McGucken then rose to speak against approving the proposal. He opposed it on several grounds. First of all, it would permit BS/MD students to graduate from the Honors Program without fulfilling the requirements that Honors students had to fulfill. Secondly, it undermined the educational philosophy of the Honors Program. Thirdly, it undermined the integrity of the Honors Program and, fourthly, its justification was without merit.

Dr. McGucken then reread the proposal's rationale (see above). He noted that in the present Honors Program students were required to take three colloquia, one in the social sciences, one in the humanities, and one in the natural sciences. The proposal would require the BS/MD students to take only two of those three colloquia - the ones in the humanities and the social sciences. They would be exempt from the natural science colloquium because they already took many science courses. But science majors in the Honors Program - people who would graduate in physics, chemistry, math, biology, and so on - had to take the science colloquium. It was a requirement, and it was here that Dr. McGucken thought that the proposal was undermining at least a part of the educational philosophy of the Honors Program. The natural science colloquium was not just another science course. Rather, it was an opportunity to look at science and discuss it from a broad cultural perspective - its history, methods and philosophy, the social, cultural and intellectual ramifications, etc. It was desirable for both science and non-science students to be engaging in a dialogue - which was what a colloquium was - and discussing these issues.

In addition to undermining the educational philosophy, the proposal undermined the integrity of the Honors Program as well. If the proposal

were passed, natural science majors in the program would wonder why they were required to take the natural science colloquium if the BS/MD people were not. If these people were also made exempt, then Honors students in the humanities or social sciences would have to be allowed to be exempt from their respective colloquia. This would further damage the integrity of the program.

In regard to the Honors Thesis, the proposal read that "A major research paper will be required. A University of Akron faculty member shall direct the paper. The work must be completed prior (emphasis by McGucken) to the completion of the undergraduate degree." Dr. McGucken thought that this was fine, but the proposal went on to provide three options, two of which he found questionable. The first said: "A student may complete a research laboratory project in Biology during the first summer of medical school" (emphasis by McGucken); that is, after they have completed the bachelors program. The second option was even more deplorable: "A student may complete a major paper as part of the Human Values in Medicine curriculum at NEOUCOM and transfer (emphasis by McGucken) up to three hours of credit back to The University of Akron." Thus, students would be transferring three hours of credit from a course that was required at Akron medical college back to the program.

Dr. McGucken then commented on a few points in the section of the proposal entitled "Additional Items." One stated that "...Honors work in the divisional major will not be required." But the Honors Program requirements state: "If Honors work exists in the major department, at least one of the contributing Honors courses must be completed." The proposal also allowed BS/MD students to take a non-Honors section of English, yet the Program required those Honors students who had to take English to take an Honors section of English composition.

The main justification for this proposal was the point that the University was losing qualified students for this program to Kent State primarily because all BS/MD students at Kent were automatically enrolled in the Honors College. Dr. McGucken wondered if this was really so and called the medical school for information on this matter. In presenting the following figures, he reminded Council members that each year Akron, Kent, and Youngstown admitted 35 students in the BS/MD program. These figures came from a five-year report just completed by the medical school. Beginning in 1984 - Akron had 295 applications, Kent 283, Youngstown 228; in 1985 - Akron 250, Kent 227, Youngstown 202; in 1986 - Akron 271, Kent 242, Youngstown 213; in 1987 - Akron 225, Kent 193, Youngstown 167; and in 1988 - Akron 300, Kent 274, Youngstown 249. For 1989, currently, Akron had 337, Kent 325, Youngstown 270. He thought that these figures indicated that Akron was the program of choice, and from this perspective there was no real reason to interfere with our Honors Program.

Dr. McGucken concluded with a suggested alternative for the BS/MD students. C&T College had what was known as a Distinguished Student Program. Exceptional students were selected in the C&T College to participate in that program, part of which involved two colloquia - one given by the C&T College, and the other selected from the three offered in the Honors Program. A successful student in this program received

the title Distinguished Student, and perhaps, until they were able to participate fully in the Honors Program, the BS/MD students might consider this option. We might have distinguished BS/MD students.

In response to Dr. McGucken's presentation, Dr. Gerlach commented that unless Council heard good arguments to the contrary, he could not see how a solitary member of the body could vote any other way than to reject this proposal.

Dean Ruebel disagreed and said that he had not heard anything in the presentation which changed his mind. For instance, the number of students who applied did not give any indication of the quality of the students that were accepted into the program. These were two completely different things. If we were talking about students who had a gpa of 3.8 and who could complete a baccalaureate degree in two-and-a-half years, he was not sure that we were really talking about diluting the program or seeing to it that the students were not going through a program rigorous enough. Dr. C. Frank Griffin stated that he had taught every student in the BS/MD program, and they all were of the highest quality.

In response to the question about the natural science colloquium, Dr. Jackson noted that the BS/MD students did take a comparable course, which went under the rather puzzling title of Health Care Delivery Systems. Having taught one of these himself and being familiar with the material in another, he thought that there might be some misunderstanding that the BS/MD students did not get the kind of information which would be presented in the natural science colloquium. He also pointed out that the BS/MD program was somewhat unusual. Many people were more familiar with a four-year bachelor degree and professional school afterward, but this system also worked quite well. It had some of the most talented students enrolled in the University in it, and he did not see why some minor accommodations in the system, which had been devised several years ago as a trial, could not be made for them.

Mr. David Jamison agreed and thought that the reasons so far offered against the proposal were not sufficient justifications for voting it down.

Dr. Roger Keller commented that it had to be remembered that a significant number of these students applied to all three universities and, after being accepted by all three, then made their final decisions. There was some competition among the universities as to which school these students would finally choose. The option which this proposal would offer them would be an inducement. He also noted that these students did take a considerable number of other kinds of courses which were not generally available to the University students as a whole, including some programs in public health. They did get a relatively broad exposure to science in general and natural science in particular. He would personally support the inclusion of these students in the Honors Program.

Dr. Gwinn then asked for permission to speak, and Council voted its

approval. Dr. Gwinn explained that this proposal came out of a comprehensive review of the BS/MD curriculum which had been initiated about two years ago. The advisory committee employed information from a variety of sources, including surveys of graduates, interviews with the medical school dean, and with the deans at the University, as well as faculty from the departments involved, etc. In considering possible changes in the curriculum, the advisory committee saw that what it was considering pretty closely paralleled the Honors Program. In discussions with the Honors Council, the committee was encouraged to create a program whose requirements would closely match the Honors Program; and what had been established in this proposal would not be an alteration to the Honors Program but rather a track within the Honors Program exclusively for those students who had entered the BS/MD program.

His reading of the charter which Council approved from the Honors Council indicated that the Honors Council had the authority to make appropriate changes, recommendations to change, and substitutions. One of the recommended changes related to the elimination of the natural science colloquium. The BS/MD students took a lot of science courses - 64 credits - and they had courses that looked at the impact of science, particularly medical science, on society through the Health Care Delivery Systems courses which Dr. Jackson mentioned and also through another course in the humanities in medicine. The committee thought that, since the students were only on campus for three summers in two years, partially due to scheduling and partially due to a redundancy the science colloquium could be left out.

In regard to the Honors Thesis, the committee recognized that it was a very significant project of work, normally extending across two semesters and often involving extensive library or laboratory research. Within the context of the BS/MD, the committee tried to create an Honors Project which would be a significant one, integrated with some independent research and/or library research.

Dr. Gwinn also wanted to point out that the Honors Program was available to students at Kent and Youngstown, but not at all at our own institution.

Dr. Jacqueline Anglin, having been an Honors preceptor in her college, thought that Council needed to consider human relations and the effect of having these students in the Honors Program. The students should not be excluded from the benefits of working one on one with a mentor. This could be of enormous help in going through what were for them quite difficult years and be an important influence in their subsequent success or failure in medical school. There were other privileges that went with being an Honors student, such as the library privileges, and also the prestige of having graduated with honors. For all of these reasons, she favored acceptance of the proposal.

Mrs. Linda Weiner asked Dr. Gwinn why these students would not have to take Honors English. When Dr. Gwinn questioned this, Dr. McGucken indicated that the proposal contained the statement that said that, in exceptional cases, they would not have to take Honors English, and this

offered a loophole that many would opt for.

Dr. David Buchthal asked whether there were any Honors students who had graduated in the last five years who did not take Honors English. Dean Claibourne Griffin said that there were, and agreed that this loophole had been there for some time and was not being introduced by this proposal. Indeed, many of the Honors students did not take English, Honors or non-Honors. He thought that it was a mistake for the BS/MD students not to be eligible for the Honors Program. However, he thought that it would be a bigger mistake to eliminate the requirement of an Honors Thesis because he thought that it was probably the most significant part of the program. For this reason, he was going to vote against the proposal.

Dr. Gerlach wondered whether the real reason behind all of this wasn't financial. Didn't Honors students have available to them various scholarships? If so, wouldn't this open the way for the medical students to gain scholarship aid through the Honors Program and possibly deprive our regular Honors students of accessibility to the same amount of funds?

Dr. Keller replied that virtually all of the BS/MD students already qualified for one scholarship or another, and he did not think that their presence in the Honors Program would dilute the availability of funds for the other Honors students. Dr. Gwinn added that students accepted into the BS/MD program automatically received a scholarship which was renewed each year, provided they maintained their grade-point average. They would be taking no funds from the regular Honors students.

The question was then called on whether or not to approve this proposal which would allow BS/MD students in the Honors Program with some special provisions. A vote was taken, and the proposal was approved.

D. Athletics Committee - Dr. George Prough wanted to formally announce to Council certain decisions made by the Athletics Department which had been very objectively reported in the newspapers lately. First, the Athletics Department had hired Coleman Crawford as Head Men's Basketball Coach, replacing former Head Coach Bob Huggins. Coach Crawford came to the University from the University of Tennessee, where he had served as Assistant Coach. He already had an excellent understanding of The University of Akron and its basketball program, having served as Assistant Coach under Huggins from 1984 to 1986.

Second, Joey Arietta, formerly Head Women's Softball Coach, had resigned from her coaching position. Personal reasons were cited for the move. She would be reassigned, probably to the sports information function and to some other administrative spot in the Department of Athletics. Bobby Curtis, Assistant Coach since 1985, would serve as Interim Head Coach for the remainder of the season, at which time a search for a person to fill the Head Coach position would begin.

E. Campus Facilities Planning Committee - Mr. Art Pollock, the

Chairman, stated that there was no report but that the Committee would meet on Friday, April 28, at 9:30 a.m.

F. Faculty Rights and Responsibilities - No report.

G. Faculty Well-Being Committee - Dr. Oller read Mr. Mark Soppeland's report. The Committee, which met on March 17, first considered the issue of anonymous evaluation of faculty versus due process, and decided to refer the issue to the Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee. It next discussed the plans and activities of the University Parking Committee. Concern was expressed over potential direct billing of faculty and staff for parking permits. It was decided to present the following resolution for Council's consideration: "Faculty and staff parking privileges will be maintained without direct financial involvement."

Finally, the Committee reviewed the continuing study of faculty and staff health benefits by the University Health Care Benefits Task Force. Many plans had been evaluated in an attempt to find the most cost effective methods of providing health coverage. Of some concern was the consideration to freeze University health care expenditures at the 1989 level. It was anticipated that health care costs would rise 16 to 25 percent in 1990. Some of these additional costs might be offset by increased efficiency in the program; much of it would be assumed by the faculty and staff.

The Chairman asked Dr. Oller about the Committee's intention regarding the statement on parking. Dr. Oller answered that Mr. Soppeland had told him that the Committee wanted Council to be aware that this was something that might be in the works and had thought that Council might want to be on record with a definite statement or reaction to this possibility. Dr. Gerlach then moved to accept the Committee's report, which included the statement with regard to parking, and the motion was seconded.

In response to Dean Isaac Hunt's query about the meaning of the resolution, Dr. Oller noted that it meant that we did not have to pay for parking. Dean Hunt thought that this a fairly convoluted way of saying it.

Dean Jane Martin wondered whether it was within the rights and responsibilities of the Council to make such a resolution. Did Council set parking fees and things of that nature? The Chairman responded that Council did not.

Dr. William Fleming believed that the answer to Dean Martin's question was that this had been considered in the University as part of the benefits package. The Chairman agreed and, as a point of information, noted that parking was not free. A fee was charged for each employee, and the University paid that fee for faculty and staff. The resolution essentially said that it was the endorsement of this body that this situation would evermore be true and that no one should ever ask that the employees themselves pay this fee. He also knew of no suggestion anywhere in the University that the practice be changed.

Dean Hunt thought that, if the students had to pay for parking, faculty could well afford to pay for theirs as well. Dr. Jackson replied that maybe the Dean could afford it.

Dr. Michael Farona thought that the argument was moot since, in a very real sense, faculty and staff were paying for their parking already. There was only so much money in the General Fund and, if some were taken out to pay for our parking privileges, there would be less for raises, etc.

The question was called, and Council voted its approval of the Committee report and the resolution on parking which it contained.

H. Library and Learning Resources Committee - Dr. Robert Kent, the Chairman reported that the Committee had met on March 7 and discussed and evaluated various proposals which had been suggested to improve security in Bierce Library. This discussion represented a culmination of the research and discussion with which the Committee had been involved over the past year and a half on the question of library security. The Committee had discussed this with Bierce Library faculty and staff and the University policy department. It had collected data on current security arrangements for the library and on the number and type of security problems reported during the fall semester of 1988 in the library, and it investigated student behavior codes and regulations for other Ohio universities as they pertained to the issue of library security. The Committee's conclusion was that the library faculty and staff had made commendable efforts to insure a safe environment in the library; however, the Committee thought that insuring the security of the library was not a responsibility which should fall on the shoulders of the librarians or library staff personnel. The security of the library could and should be improved, and this responsibility properly belonged to the University police department operating in conjunction with the library's Director and the faculty. As a result of these deliberations, the Committee unanimously passed a resolution, with two suggested accompanying resolutions, regarding a Library Patrol for consideration by Council (see Appendix A). Dr. Kent then read the resolution with its "Whereas" justifications.

The Chairman relinquished the Chair to Dr. John Bee, President Pro Tem of Council. Dr. Farona commented that it was difficult for him to appreciate the proposal without any accompanying data. He had not been aware that problems in the Bierce Library were so extreme as to go all the way to a police state. He wanted to know what the problems were, what attempts had been made to rectify them, and why such extreme action had been proposed. He also was concerned about how one would decide on a person's psychological instability and who would make that decision.

Dr. Kent responded that much negative publicity about library security had appeared over the past year in such places as Paul Harvey's radio program, as well as locally in The Buchtelite. Much of it related to such things as reports of young people having sex in the study carrels and a foot fetishist who had sent as many as five letters to one librarian, and who had asked a number of women in the library if he could touch their feet. In reference to Dr. Farona's comment about a

police state, Dr. Kent wanted to point out that at present uniformed police personnel were assigned to the library and were on duty Sunday through Thursday from 9 to 11 p.m., Friday from 5:30 to 9, and Saturday from 4 to 8 p.m. The Committee did have data on incidents in the library during the fall semester. There were 29 incidents, including 8 thefts, 1 sexual offense, 5 harassments, 1 safety hazard, 1 lost person, 1 lost property, 9 suspicious persons, and 2 menacing incidents.

Dr. Marini then rose to state that he had a motion to offer in respect to this proposal which he wished to preface with an introductory comment. He had once been on a campus where a department during its regular meeting decided to vote that the university would supply an administrative assistant for the department chair, and then proceeded to vote what the salaries would be for the following year in that department. In the past few years he had had great hopes for the strengthening of Council as part of a shared approach to governing the campus, and he had tried to do everything he could to achieve this. A lot of the people in Council had worked toward that goal also, but here this afternoon Council had just considered an item of business relating to parking fees and how they would and would not be charged. A short time ago Council had voted on whether paychecks would be issued twice a month to employees to whom they were presently being issued once a month. Now it was deciding not only that there was a safety problem in the library, but how many people should be patrolling the library and what they should do when they saw something. In effect, it was deciding police procedures. He thought that it was only a little way before Council would start voting salaries for faculty, if it was going to vote on fringe benefits like parking fees.

He therefore wanted to present a motion to table this proposal. He really believed that how Council behaved would affect the credibility of the body. As Council proceeded to vote on more and more things which were properly matters on which only the Board of Trustees could vote or were administrative questions, such as how the library was to be monitored, it would destroy its ability to do that which only Council could do. If Council wanted to pass a resolution calling a safety problem to the attention of the University, or the President, or the police, he thought that it would be appropriate. However, when it started saying how many people should patrol, in what fashion, and what they should do when they saw something, Council was behaving entirely inappropriately and would lose its credibility for those things which only it could do. He then moved to table, and the motion was seconded.

In response to a question as to whether the motion to table was debatable, Dr. Gerlach said that unfortunately it was not, and that the motion was foul play.

The Chairman (Dr. Bee) then called for a vote, and the motion to table was passed by a vote of 20 to 16, with 4 abstentions. Dr. Marini then returned to the Chair.

I. Reference Committee - No report.

Dr. McGucken then asked the Chairman what was going to happen with

regard to the issue which had been genuinely and sincerely brought before Council by the Library Committee and had just been tabled.

Dr. Kent added that the Committee's concern had been to bring the issue and problem to the attention of Council - not the specifics of the proposal, which Dr. Marini had referred to. The Committee's conclusion had been that (1) there was a perception of a security problem in the library among patrons and the people who worked there; and (2) it was not the responsibility of the library to pay for police protection in the library as it was currently doing, and this was properly the responsibility of the University police. This was the sense of the proposal - to alert Council to the problem and ask it to look into the matter. The Committee had spent over a year and a half on this problem and did not take the issue lightly. People had been talking about the problem and something needed to be done. The members of the Committee were not experts in criminal justice, etc. with regard to the specifics. They had simply suggested this as a way of beginning to deal with the problem.

The Chairman offered a partial answer to Dr. McGucken's question. By the next meeting of Council, he would attempt to look into the matter and discuss it with the police. He had already received a memo from the Director of the ULLR about this, which was not entirely supportive of the resolution which had been presented to Council. He would discuss it both with the Director and campus police, and he would report back to Council at its next meeting about this matter. It would be entirely appropriate for any member of Council to move to take this resolution from the table at that time.

J. Research (Faculty Projects) Committee - Dr. Carl McMillin, the Chairman, reported that the Committee had met on March 3 and evaluated 24 proposals for Spring Faculty Research Grants. Sixteen proposals were funded, for a total of \$38,146, and a list of these had already been published in the March 27 issue of the Chronicle. Attached to his report for publication in the next Chronicle was a breakdown by department and college of the number of proposals submitted and percent of proposals funded, both in the past year and from 1983 to the present (see Appendix B). It just might alleviate some of the concerns that some people had on the fairness of the awards.

The ad hoc committee, which had been assembled to review the processes involved in research grant evaluation, had been meeting in subcommittees and met again as a body on March 9. A large number of issues were discussed and evaluated. Recommendations were given to the Vice President for Research and Sponsored Projects for presentation to the Research Committee when it first meets in the fall.

K. Student Affairs Committee - No report.

Item No. 6 - Report of the Akron Representative of the Faculty Advisory Committee to the Chancellor, Ohio Board of Regents. Dr. Mary Rainey stated that she had submitted a written report, and would continue to do so for the rest of the year (see Appendix C).

Item No. 7 - Unfinished Business and General Orders. The Chairman stated that the first item of business was representation of Contract Professionals on University Council, and he recognized Dr. Frank Griffin. Dr. Griffin stated that in the fall Council had passed a change in its Bylaws giving the General Faculty (Contract Professional/Instructional group) membership on Council. President Muse had vetoed this resolution, giving the reason that all Contract Professionals should be represented. Dr. Griffin now wished to move the adoption of a new proposal from Dr. Irv Brandel which incorporated the President's wish and also raised the representation from one to two, since the number represented would go from about 150 to 250. A separate proposal had been made by Patrick Darrah, and anyone who favored that one might do so by offering amendments to the Brandel proposal at the next meeting. With the urging that all debate on this issue be delayed until the next meeting, he moved the adoption of the Brandel proposal for Bylaws changes providing two Contract Professional representatives to Council. This was seconded by Dr. Bee.

In answer to Dean Hunt's question regarding the postponement of debate, the Chairman noted that, as is usual with Bylaws changes, Council could not act on this motion at this meeting. It was possible to discuss the issue now, but the mover was urging that debate be postponed until next time.

Council then moved on to the motion to amend Council Bylaws, Section 3359-10-07 Meetings:

(H) ANY SEVEN MEMBERS OF COUNCIL MAY REQUIRE THAT VOTES ON SUBSTANTIVE ISSUES OR LEGISLATION BE TAKEN BY BALLOT OR BY ROLL CALL.

The Chairman asked Dr. Gerlach, as the mover of the motion, if he wished to speak to it. Dr. Gerlach said that he had tried to explain the reason for it at an earlier meeting. The intent of this motion was to allow Council to get round the point of Robert's Rules, which would require a majority vote of Council for a ballot or roll call vote. In bodies like University Council, it was considered to be cricket, or proper, for something far less than a majority to be able to call for such a recorded vote.

The Chairman, hearing no further discussion, called for a vote, and the motion carried. However, Dr. Gerlach asked for an exact count because an amendment to the Bylaws required a majority of the voting membership of Council, not just a majority of the members present. The Chairman called for the vote again, and there were 33 votes in the affirmative. Since a majority of voting members of Council would be 40, the motion was defeated.

A discussion initiated by Dr. Gerlach followed about how this motion could be brought back for a second vote. The Chairman concluded that this could be done in two ways - either somebody who had voted against it (the prevailing side, since the motion failed) could move to reintroduce it at the next meeting, or a Council member could introduce the motion or its essentials again and let it proceed through the

regular process.

The next item of business was a motion to amend Faculty Manual section 3359-20-02 Organization of the University (5)(vi), pertaining to department head evaluations (see Appendix D). When Council had adjourned in March it had been discussing this motion, and Dr. Fleming had offered an amendment which would replace the language "These evaluations shall include a question, 'Shall the department head be retained?'" with "The dean shall require a secret ballot of each member of each department at least once in every four years, oftener as circumstances may suggest, and these ballots shall require a 60 percent support for retention of the department head in that office." Council now returned to that amendment.

Dr. Rainey wanted to speak against the figure of 60 percent for retention because she believed that it was too high. Department heads had a great many constituencies to which they answered - students, faculty, and administrators. Their roles were difficult and at times not popular. She moved that the phrase "without a favorable vote of 60 percent of the faculty" be amended to "without a majority vote of the department faculty." Dr. Jackson seconded the motion.

Dr. Fleming said that he was not insensitive to the problems which department heads and division chairmen might have in these voting situations. His rationale for the 60 percent had been to have a figure which would avoid the possibility of an even division of votes and no clear decision.

Dr. Gerlach noted that the provision in the Faculty Manual for initial appointment of department heads by the board indicated that a two-thirds vote of the faculty members of the department was required. What was wrong with requiring something like two-thirds to retain them?

Dr. Paul Merrix pointed out that there was a great deal of difference because a person who came into the position with a two-thirds vote had not yet committed his first act as head. The person might have been brought in to shake up a department which very badly needed to be shaken up, and after four years on the job he might not even get 50 percent, let alone 60 percent. That did not mean that the person was not doing a good job. Dr. Merrix suggested a figure of 51 or 52 percent because 60 percent was just too high.

Dean Griffin wanted to argue for a "no" vote on the entire question. He had department heads in his college who right now probably could not even get 10 percent approval in their department, but it was still in the department's best interests to retain them. This was not a popularity contest, and the office should not be held by Mr. or Ms. Congeniality. He did not like the whole idea of a vote on the continuation of the department head under any circumstances.

The Chairman then called for a vote, and Dr. Rainey's amendment passed. Council then returned to Dr. Fleming's amendment.

Dean Atwood wondered how faculty could be required to vote. He

thought that it would be better to say "He shall conduct a secret ballot," rather than "require a secret ballot," and moved that language as an amendment. This was seconded.

After some discussion, Council voted on the amendment, and it was passed.

Dr. Bee then pointed out that if Dr. Fleming's amendment were passed as it was now worded, if five people in a 10-person department returned ballots and only three were in favor, then the department head had received a majority of the ballots and would be recommended for retention. Since no one could be required to vote, the majority figure would not pertain to the total number of faculty in the department but to the number of those actually voting.

The Chairman agreed with Dr. Bee's interpretation, and Dean Hunt attempted to deal with this by amending the language of the first part of the motion to read "The dean shall conduct a secret ballot of all members of..." - replacing "each" with "all," and adding an "s" to "member." This was seconded.

Dr. Mary Ellen Atwood reminded Council that this was not a police state. It was a democracy, and no one could make her vote on anything. She had the right to abstain on a ballot and not participate in an election. The Chairman answered that there was nothing in the language of Dr. Fleming's amendment which would attempt to force her to vote if she did not want to.

After a bit more discussion, Dean Hunt's amendment was passed by Council.

Dean Hunt then went on to make a further amendment so that the vote would require a majority of the total departmental membership to support retaining the department head in his office. This was seconded.

In the ensuing discussion, there was a great deal of confusion regarding the abstention vote. How was it to be counted in relation to the majority? Was it a "no" vote? Council voted down Dean Hunt's amendment which would have required a majority of the total departmental membership's support for retention of the department head, but discussion continued regarding the interpretation of an abstention vote. Finally, Dr. Jackson suggested that because there was so much confusion it would be appropriate to postpone this item until the next meeting of Council. People could think about what the implications of the vote were and be prepared to take action on it. This motion was seconded, and the Secretary was asked to inform the Executive Committee that this item should be placed at the top of the agenda for the next Council meeting. Council then voted to postpone discussion.

Item No. 9 - Motion for Adjournment. Dr. Faith Helmick then moved to adjourn, and this was seconded. Council voted its approval, and the meeting ended at 4:55 p.m.

APPENDIX A

ULLR Committee Resolution to Improve Library Security

Whereas the replacement of damaged, mutilated, or stolen books, periodicals, and other library materials is costly and adversely affects the library budget.

Whereas damage to library furniture and fixed facilities is costly.

Whereas inappropriate behavior (eating, drinking, and loud talking, and socializing) by some library patrons is detrimental to the academic atmosphere of the library.

Whereas library security for persons and their personal property should receive higher priority, and current personnel assigned to this task are inadequate.

The University Council recommends that the President approve and present the following resolution to the Board of Trustees for adoption, effective Fall Semester 1989:

1. The University of Akron Police Department shall create a Library Patrol for the surveillance of the library. The Library Patrol shall be managed, trained, funded, by the Director of University Safety and Security. The duty of uniformed Library Patrol shall be to enforce posted regulations by issuing written warnings and tickets for amounts of up to \$50.00 for minor infractions. The Library Patrol shall call UAPD officers to the scene when more serious violations occur.

Suggested Accompanying Resolution to Amend the Faculty Manual, Student Disciplinary Procedures, Section 3359-40-01 Campus Conduct, effective Fall Semester 1989:

1. Add new clauses as (F), (2), (c), (d) and (e) [then re-letter the subsequent existing clauses as (f) through (j)] as follows:
 - (c) Failure to identify oneself when asked;
 - (d) Engaging in lewd, indecent, obscene, degrading or morally embarrassing conduct; inappropriate sexual language or correspondence constituting sexual harassment; sexual harassment; or evidencing psychological instability that endangers others or disrupts the normal functioning of the University;
2. Insert the additional words in (G), line 5, after "to" and before "suspension": fines of up to \$50.00,

[This section applies to everybody who sets foot on campus]

Additional Accompanying Resolution to Amend the Faculty Manual, Student Disciplinary Procedures, Section 3359-41-02 Definition of Student Misconduct, effective Fall Semester 1989:

1. Insert in line 3, after "violates", the additional word "posted."
2. Insert in line 6, after "result", the additional phrase "in referral to the University Counseling Service for psychological evaluation and"
3. Insert in line 7, after "of", the additional phrase "finest of up to \$50.00"
4. Add new sections (Q), (R), and (S) on the second page:

(Q) Misconduct in University libraries

- (a) Making loud noise
- (b) Bringing in unwrapped food and beverages; eating in non-designated areas
- (c) Abuse of books, periodicals, newspapers, electronic equipment, and other library materials
- (d) Disobeying posted instructions and signage

(R) Engaging in lewd, indecent, obscene, degrading, or morally embarrassing conduct; sexual harassment;

(S) Emotional Instability

A student who shows evidence of psychological instability that may pose danger to that student or others, or may interfere with the normal functioning of the University, may be required to see a psychologist or a psychiatrist. If the student does not secure psychological help, or if the student's behavior warrants it, he or she may be suspended from the University. Confirmation from a psychologist or psychiatrist that the student has been under treatment, may return to the University without danger to herself/himself or others, and will not disrupt the normal functioning of the University, is necessary for readmission.

A student may be required to go to the University Counseling service for psychological evaluation before disciplinary action for suspension or dismissal begins. This shall be decided by the Dean of Student Services.

[This section differs from the previous section since it applies only to students who, unlike others, are subject to both Student Disciplinary Procedures and the Ohio Revised Code, etc.]

APPENDIX B**FACULTY RESEARCH GRANTS AND SUMMER FELLOWSHIPS**

549 Total applications Submitted Since 1983

48.9% Average Funded of All Applications

	<u>Number Submitted</u>		<u>Percent Funded</u>	
	<u>1983-89</u>	<u>1988-89</u>	<u>1983-89</u>	<u>1988-89</u>
ARTS & SCIENCES				
(321 proposals submitted 1983-89, 51.1% funded)				
Biology	41	5	59	60
Chemistry	60	9	63	100
Classics	6	0	67	-
Economics	9	1	33	0
English	26	4	46	25
Geography	8	0	75	-
Geology	29	4	52	25
History	27	5	63	60
Math Sciences	39	3	26	67
Modern Languages	2	0	0	-
Philosophy	1	0	0	-
Physics	23	3	52	0
Political Science	7	3	71	100
Polymer Science	1	1	100	100
Psychology	14	3	50	67
Sociology	25	0	32	-
Urban Studies	3	1	67	100
BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION				
(154 proposals submitted 1983-89, 42.9% funded)				
Accounting	7	0	14	-
Finance	1	0	100	-
Management	0	0	-	-
Marketing	6	2	67	50
COMMUNITY & TECHNICAL COLLEGE				
(23 proposals submitted 1983-89, 21.7% funded)				
Allied Health	0	0	-	-
Associate Studies	0	0	-	-
Business Technology	0	0	-	-
Engineering & Science	14	6	29	17
Public Service	1	0	100	-
Women's Studies	1	0	0	-
Criminal Justice	3	0	0	-
C & T	4	0	0	-

	<u>Number Submitted</u>		<u>Percent Funded</u>	
	<u>1983-89</u>	<u>1988-89</u>	<u>1983-89</u>	<u>1988-89</u>
EDUCATION				
(23 proposals submitted 1983-89, 17.3% funded)				
Counseling & Special Education	6	1	0	0
Educational Administration	2	1	50	0
Educational Foundations	4	0	25	-
Elementary Education	1	0	0	-
Health & Physical Education	1	0	0	-
Secondary Education	1	0	0	-
Education	8	0	25	-
ENGINEERING				
(95 proposals submitted 1983-89, 53.7% funded)				
Biomedical	17	4	65	100
Chemical	14	0	64	-
Civil	4	0	75	-
Electrical	16	2	50	100
Mechanical	35	8	40	88
Polymer	7	3	71	67
Engineering	2	0	50	-
FINE & APPLIED ARTS				
(43 proposals submitted 1983-89, 48.8% funded)				
Art	19	4	53	75
Communication	4	2	0	0
Communicative Disorders	4	1	75	100
Dance	2	0	50	-
Home Economics & Family Ecology	5	1	40	100
Music	6	2	50	100
Theatre Arts	3	0	67	-
SCHOOL OF LAW				
(10 proposals submitted 1983-89, 50% funded)				
	10	0	50	-
SCHOOL OF NURSING				
(15 proposals submitted 1983-89, 53% funded)				
	15	3	53	100

April 27, 1989

Page 24

	<u>Number Submitted</u>		<u>Percent Funded</u>	
	<u>1983-89</u>	<u>1988-89</u>	<u>1983-89</u>	<u>1988-89</u>
UNIVERSITY LIBRARY & LEARNING RESOURCES (3 proposals submitted 1983-89, 0% funded)	3	2	0	0

Compiled by Carl McMillin
Chairman, Research (Faculty Projects) Committee



APPENDIX C

3600 State Office Tower
30 East Broad Street
Columbus, Ohio 43266-0417

Administration: (614) 466-6000
Student Assistance: (614) 466-7420

Memorandum

TO: Members, Board of Regents

FROM: William B. Coulter, Chancellor

DATE: March 7, 1989

SUBJECT: Highlights of Substitute House Bill 111

Today the House Finance Committee presented a substitute bill for 1990-1991 operations. Higher education received an additional \$70.7 million and starts in a major way the repair of the Executive Budget -- the current revenues budget.

Top billing was given to the Instructional Subsidies, \$20.1 million and \$36.3 million. With the models endorsed by OBM, the fee assumption increase during the two-year period would stand at 21.8%. We still have a way to go toward \$200 million.

Other highlights:

	(thousands)	
	<u>FY90</u>	<u>FY91</u>
Sea Grants	+200	+200
Cooperative Extension	+350	+350
(language requires \$200,000 per year be spent for 4-H)		
Agricultural Research & Development	+500	+1,000
(language directs this increase to be spent at the Piketon Center)		
Shawnee State Supplement	+1,500	+1,600
Demonstration Laboratories	+380	+600
(this permits a beginning on the Regents' access strategy)		
Labor Education	+400	+450
Police and Fire Protection	+300	+325
OSU Cancer Hospital	+1,500	+2,500
Long-term Care Research	+300	+300
WCPN-CSU Radio Link	+150	+150
Urban Universities	+267	+275
Ohio University Innovation Center	+ 94	+ 54
Rural University Project	+ 27	+ 28
Water Resources Center	+118	+118
Firefighters Hazardous Materials	+160	+170
OBR - Personal Services	- 49	- 52

Page 2

Amendments will be heard and a floor vote is scheduled for March 17. It is my impression the above reflects about what the House will be able to accomplish at this stage. Stay tuned!

ck

April 27, 1989

OHIO BOARD OF REGENTS
HIGHER EDUCATION OPERATING APPROPRIATIONS
(Thousands)

Page 27

	Final Appropriation 1987-1988	Final Appropriation 1988-1989	Regents' Recommendation 1989-1990	Regents' Recommendation 1990-1991	Executive Budget 1989-1990	Executive Budget 1990-1991	House Substitute Bill 1989-1990	House Substitute Bill 1990-1991
INSTRUCTION								
Instructional Subsidies	\$1,043,226.1	\$1,083,653.2	\$1,249,929.8	\$1,408,974.7	\$1,113,864.9	\$1,153,096.1	\$1,133,364.9	\$1,129,396.1
SELECTIVE EXCELLENCE								
Eminent Scholar	\$0.0	\$4,500.0	\$0.0	\$4,500.0	\$0.0	\$4,500.0	\$0.0	\$4,500.0
Program Excellence	0.0	3,000.0	0.0	3,000.0	0.0	3,000.0	0.0	3,000.0
Academic Challenge	11,000.0	11,400.0	13,500.0	14,700.0	11,400.0	11,742.0	11,400.0	11,742.0
Research Challenge	10,563.6	12,546.1	13,298.9	14,163.3	11,700.0	11,700.0	11,700.0	11,700.0
Productivity Challenge	2,500.0	2,500.0	3,580.0	3,820.0	3,001.9	2,628.5	3,001.9	2,528.5
Ohio Supercomputer	3,000.0	4,500.0	5,000.0	4,500.0	4,500.0	4,500.0	4,500.0	4,500.0
Library Access System	0.0	0.0	250.0	250.0	206.2	226.1	206.2	226.1
Indep College Challenge	0.0	0.0	0.0	1,000.0	0.0	750.0	0.0	750.0
Sub-total	\$25,763.6	\$38,146.1	\$35,428.9	\$45,933.3	\$30,808.1	\$37,046.6	\$30,808.1	\$39,046.6
ACCESS								
Ohio Instructional Grants	\$39,750.0	\$40,050.0	\$69,000.0	\$88,200.0	\$42,700.0	\$44,281.0	\$42,700.0	\$44,281.0
BIG for Proprietary Schools	10,750.0	9,800.0			2,727.9	1,116.9	2,727.9	1,116.9
Single Parent Grants	0.0	0.0	4,000.0	5,000.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
War Orphans	1,520.2	1,931.0	2,203.9	2,505.3	1,931.0	1,988.9	1,931.0	1,988.9
Academic Scholarships	3,591.0	3,591.0	3,591.0	3,591.0	3,591.0	3,591.0	3,591.0	3,591.0
Developmental Education	2,017.0	2,097.7	5,000.0	5,225.0	2,097.7	2,160.6	2,097.7	2,160.6
Urban Initiatives	199.5	199.5	300.0	300.0	199.5	205.5	199.5	205.5
Central State Supplement	8,088.5	8,088.5	8,225.0	8,225.0	8,088.5	8,225.0	8,088.5	8,225.0
Student Choice Grants	15,527.4	15,527.4	21,000.0	22,900.0	15,562.1	16,520.8	15,562.1	16,520.8
Access Learning Projects	150.0	150.0	450.0	450.0	400.0	400.0	400.0	400.0
Access/Retention Incentive	0.0	0.0	9,123.6	10,084.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Minority Graduate Opportunity	0.0	0.0	2,000.0	2,250.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Early Intervention	0.0	0.0	2,000.0	4,000.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
School/College Transitions	0.0	0.0	750.0	750.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Demonstration Laboratories	0.0	0.0	600.0	600.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Sub-total	\$81,593.6	\$81,433.1	\$128,243.5	\$154,180.3	\$77,697.7	\$78,489.7	\$77,997.7	\$79,089.7
RESEARCH, PUBLIC SERVICE, MISC								
Aerospace Institute	0.0	0.0	440.0	244.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Undergraduate Improvement	0.0	0.0	45.0	3,048.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Agriculture R & D Center	\$19,151.1	\$19,541.6	20,714.1	22,060.5	19,541.6	\$20,127.8	20,041.6	21,127.8
Cooperative Extension	11,224.4	11,453.3	12,590.5	13,408.9	11,453.3	11,796.9	11,803.3	12,146.9
Urban Universities	2,565.4	2,668.1	3,178.2	3,412.0	2,401.2	2,473.3	2,668.1	2,748.1
Labor Education Service	1,211.9	1,211.9	1,284.6	1,368.1	1,211.9	1,248.3	1,611.9	1,698.3
Displaced Homemakers	269.0	279.7	296.5	315.8	279.7	288.1	279.7	288.1
OSU-Sea Grants	199.5	199.5	211.5	225.2	0.0	0.0	200.0	200.0
Artificial Intelligence	350.0	350.0	371.0	395.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
OU-Innovation Center	187.0	187.0	198.2	211.1	93.5	96.3	187.5	150.0
Rural University Projects	254.0	269.0	285.1	303.7	242.1	249.4	269.0	277.0
Central St Water Resources	300.0	300.0	318.0	338.7	300.0	309.0	418.0	427.0
Cleveland St Haz Mat Prog	100.0	150.0	159.0	169.3	0.0	0.0	160.0	170.0
Shawnee State U. Supplement	1,000.0	3,200.0	4,000.0	4,000.0	3,200.0	3,296.0	4,700.0	4,896.0
Long Term Care Research	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	300.0	300.0
CSU Radio Link	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	150.0	150.0
Sub-total	\$36,812.3	\$39,810.1	\$44,091.7	\$49,520.4	\$38,723.3	\$39,885.1	\$42,789.1	\$44,579.2
HEALTH MANPOWER								
Clinical-Medicine								
OSU	\$13,605.6	\$13,605.6	14,694.0	15,649.2	13,986.5	\$14,476.0	13,986.5	\$14,476.0
UC	11,190.4	11,190.4	12,085.6	12,871.2	11,503.7	11,906.3	11,503.7	11,906.3
MCOT	8,722.3	8,722.3	9,420.1	10,032.4	8,966.5	9,280.4	8,966.5	9,290.4
MSU	4,096.5	4,096.5	4,424.2	4,711.8	4,211.2	4,358.6	4,211.2	4,358.6
OU	4,096.5	4,096.5	4,424.2	4,711.8	4,211.2	4,358.6	4,211.2	4,358.6
NEQUCOM	4,096.5	4,096.5	4,424.2	4,711.8	4,211.2	4,358.6	4,211.2	4,358.6
Clinical-Dental and Vet Med								
OSU	981.5	981.5	1,060.0	1,128.9	981.5	1,011.0	981.5	1,011.0
CMRU-Medicine	5,195.3	5,195.3	5,510.9	5,975.6	5,340.8	5,527.7	5,340.8	5,527.7
-Dental	792.5	792.5	800.0	800.0	792.5	792.5	792.5	792.5
Primary Care	3,679.4	3,679.4	3,975.8	4,232.0	3,679.4	3,789.8	3,679.4	3,789.8
Family Practice	7,598.4	7,598.4	8,206.3	8,739.7	7,598.4	7,826.3	7,598.4	7,826.3
Geriatric Med	1,329.7	1,329.7	1,436.1	1,742.4	1,329.7	1,369.6	1,329.7	1,369.6
Child Abuse Prevention	256.0	262.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
OSU Cancer Hospital	0.0	1,000.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1,500.0	2,500.0
Podiatric Clinical	1,000.0	1,225.0	1,298.5	1,382.9	1,225.0	1,261.8	1,225.0	1,261.8
Area Health Educ Center	1,700.0	1,900.0	2,164.0	2,554.7	1,900.0	1,957.0	1,900.0	1,957.0
Medical Education Finance Study	0.0	0.0	250.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Sub-total	\$68,340.6	\$69,551.3	\$73,972.0	\$78,444.5	\$69,445.1	\$71,481.7	\$70,945.1	\$73,981.7
PLANNING & COORDINATION								
Personnel Services	\$2,017.4	\$2,161.6	\$2,490.0	\$2,650.0	\$2,455.3	\$2,620.9	\$2,406.2	\$2,568.4
Maintenance	740.3	762.6	800.0	840.0	809.9	850.5	809.9	850.5
Equipment	10.0	23.8	40.0	40.0	38.1	40.0	38.1	40.0
Library Planning	49.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Information Systems Improvement	0.0	0.0	260.0	250.0	260.0	250.0	260.0	250.0
Sub-total	\$2,817.2	\$2,948.0	\$3,590.0	\$3,780.0	\$3,563.3	\$3,761.3	\$3,514.2	\$3,708.9
FACILITIES								
Facilities Renovation	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$18,700.0	\$18,700.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0
Equipment Replacement	0.0	0.0	13,000.0	13,000.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Police & Fire	265.8	265.8	281.7	300.1	0.0	0.0	300.0	325.0
OSU-Telecommunications	1,000.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Sub-total	\$1,265.8	\$265.8	\$18,981.7	\$32,000.1	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$300.0	\$325.0
TOTAL	\$1,260,919.2	\$1,315,809.6	\$1,567,237.6	\$1,772,833.2	\$1,334,102.4	\$1,385,760.5	\$1,360,219.1	\$1,430,127.2
Debt Service	\$188,882.0	\$225,740.0			\$256,121.0	\$268,953.0	\$256,121.0	\$263,953.0
GRAND TOTAL	\$1,449,801.2	\$1,541,549.6			\$1,590,223.4	\$1,654,713.5	\$1,616,340.1	\$1,694,080.2

Revised 3-7-99

APPENDIX D

Amend Faculty Manual section 3359-20-02 Organization of the University, (5) (vi) as follows:

Each college Dean, in consultation with the elected members of University Council from that college, shall initially synchronize the review of the department head. In assigning priorities, the Dean shall attempt to have approximately one-fourth of the departments reviewed each year. THE REVIEW SHALL CONSIST OF AN EXAMINATION OF THE DEPARTMENT HEAD'S VITA, INTERVIEWS WITH EACH FACULTY MEMBER, AND ~~ANONYMOUS~~ WRITTEN EVALUATIONS SOLICITED FROM EACH MEMBER OF THE DEPARTMENT IN QUESTION. THESE EVALUATIONS SHALL INCLUDE A QUESTION, "SHALL THE DEPARTMENT HEAD BE RETAINED?" WITHOUT A FAVORABLE VOTE OF 60% OF THE DEPARTMENT FACULTY, A NEW HEAD SHALL BE SELECTED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE DEPARTMENT'S GUIDELINES. THE DEAN SHALL THEN COMMUNICATE HIS/HER EVALUATION OF SAID DEPARTMENT HEAD TO THE PROVOST AND TO THE RELEVANT FACULTY ACCOMPANIED BY ALL DOCUMENTATION INCLUDING THE ~~ANONYMOUS~~ FACULTY ~~LETTERS~~ EVALUATIONS. RECORDS SHALL BE KEPT OF THIS MATERIAL.

The proposed Fleming amendment as revised to this point:

"The dean shall CONDUCT ~~require~~ a secret ballot of ALL ~~each~~ members of each department at least once in every four years, oftener as circumstances may suggest, and these ballots shall require a MAJORITY ~~80 percent support~~ for retention of the department head in the office." Dr. Fleming is requesting that this be inserted in place of "These evaluations shall include a question, 'Shall the department head be retained?'"

DR. FRANK MARINI
OFF: SENIOR VP & PROVOST
BH 105

RECEIVED
APR 28 1989
SR VP & DL